

REMARKS

In the September 8, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-14, 18 and 19 were pending in the application and were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 5,627,877 to Penttonen; 5,958,016 to Chang et al.; and 6,714,636 to Baiyor et al. (References A-C, respectively, in the April 9, 2004 Office Action) were cited. Claims 20 and 21 have been added and thus, claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-14 and 18-21 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Examiner Interview

The undersigned wishes to thank the Examiner and his supervisor for granting the Examiner Interview held on November 18, 2004. The independent claims have been amended as discussed at the Examiner Interview and claims 20 and 21 have been added to further clarify the information being provided by the information servers.

During the November 18, 2004 Examiner Interview, the differences between the architecture of and operations performed by the components in the system disclosed by Penttonen and the present invention were discussed. There was preliminary agreement that the amendments to the independent claims are sufficient to distinguish over the significantly different architecture and operations of the system disclosed by Penttonen. In accordance with the statement in the Interview Summary, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone prior to issuing another Office Action if it is believed that the claims do not distinguish over Penttonen or if new prior art is found that is believed to make the independent claims unpatentable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As discussed during the November 18, 2004 Examiner Interview and in the responses to the first two Office Actions, Penttonen is directed to relocating a subscriber of a voice messaging system in a GSM mobile network which has a plurality of mobile switching centres (MSC), where "[e]ach MSC in the network has its own VMS" (column 2, line 21) and VMS stands for voice messaging system. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the GSM mobile network has a centrally located home location register (HLR) and administration (ADMIN) computer. Thus, in reading the claims on Penttonen the "at least one central management server" (e.g., claim 5, line 2) would correspond to one or both of the HLR and ADMIN computer, while the "information servers geographically distributed" (e.g., claim 5, line 2) would correspond to the voice messaging systems.

However, the September 8, 2004 Office Action made it clear that instead of correctly matching the topology recited in the claims on the GSM mobile network described by Penttonen, the claims were being interpreted contrary to the limitations recited in the preambles of claims 5 and 12 and in the body of claim 18. Suggested amendments to the preambles in an attempt to prevent such misreading of the claims was rejected during the Examiner Interview. Therefore, the independent claims have been amended to clarify the operations performed by the information servers to more clearly recite that the elements of the system disclosed by Penttonen that most closely correspond to the information servers recited in the claims are the voice messaging systems, not the mobile switching centres. Further details regarding the types of information provided by the information servers has been recited in new claims 20 and 21.

As discussed in the previous responses, when appropriate weight is given to the limitations recited in the preambles and the meaning of the term "information server" is interpreted consistent with the description in the specification, as required by law, it is clear that Penttonen does not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. The addition of either Baiyor et al. or Chang et al. does not provide any suggestion of the major modifications to Penttonen that would be required to meet the limitations recited in the independent claims. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-14 and 18-21 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 09/739,745

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/8/04

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501